

Date: Wed, 12 May 93 04:30:24 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #139
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 12 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 139

Today's Topics:

Emergency preparedness, was...Re: no-code defense
 More on no-code (2 msgs)
 Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m (2 msgs)
 Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?
 sick of it all
 The Canonical list of Autopatch Answers
 what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense)
 woops

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 11 May 93 21:59:39 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Emergency preparedness, was...Re: no-code defense
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>In article <2284@indep1.UUCP> clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:
>> Let's try a scenario. The "big one" his Los Angeles. No power, no
>>repeaters, most equipment is junk, no transportation, no phones, no
>>communications. While you're still trying to figure out how to modulate
>>a carrier, I'll be on the air, with a LEGAL transmitter in a LEGAL ham
>>band, communicating with the outside world, because I can design, build
>>and power a CW transmitter/receiver... and I can use CW.
>

>Let me see if I can fully understand this. The "big one hits" and your
>the only one with communications capability because you're going to build
>your own CW transceiver and then use it to talk to the world. Indeed,
>if all the equipment is rendered junk, by what stroke of luck do you
>presume your home will be spared, AND if it isn't spared, how do
>you propose to build your CW rig (e.g. assemble AND power the
>your home made CW rig?

This is an age old red herring brought up every time someone feels a need to justify forcing everyone to learn CW as a means to saving their lives. It's similar to the "you've crashed in an airplane and the microphone on the radio was destroyed" argument. As for the ease of building a CW transmitter, I'm sure I can build an SSB or FM transmitter as easily out of the random parts in my shack as Cliff can build a CW transmitter out of the parts in his. Heck, I have chips that are nearly a complete FM transmitter. Add a few discrete components and you're on the air. Carving a piece of quartz and pushing a wire onto germanium are a thing of the past.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Tue, 11 May 93 22:36:49 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@ames.arpa
Subject: More on no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C6vq8t.Ex5@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

> Above all, getting back to the original topic how are you going to guarantee
> that the vast majority of new users won't just bypass that ("hey, that
> CW stuff is just too slow for complex discussion), and just overcrowd
> the bands with SSB? :-)

1. Because, empirically, they don't. We already know that.
2. You're proposing the change, so it's *your* burden of proof.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Tue, 11 May 1993 23:03:23 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!

news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: More on no-code

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

: In article <C6vq8t.Ex5@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

: > Above all, getting back to the original topic how are you going to guarantee
: > that the vast majority of new users won't just bypass that ("hey, that
: > CW stuff is just too slow for complex discussion), and just overcrowd
: > the bands with SSB? :-)

:

: 1. Because, empirically, they don't. We already know that.

^^^^^^^^^^^^ and YOU are unbiased?

: 2. You're proposing the change, so it's *your* burden of proof.

Oh good now we're getting close! What would you like to see proven, specifically? I have never, to the best of my knowledge said it would be a good thing to completely eliminate code from licensing in the US. I have pointed out how ridiculous many of your arguments are. Well, the ones that I felt weren't self evident and even some that were. ;-) Gee maybe if someone does publish the stats. they said existed that delineate actual band and mode usage we be able to check the validity of statement #1 Would you rather see the CW portion of the bands overcrowded? Or would you rather just keep the number of hams to a *managable* level so that regular people can't get on the air. To claim you want to keep the bands from becoming crowded you are only showing that you wish to remain an elitist. Had you said that you don't want to see the band filled with lids and such I would have agreed with you whole heartedly. But then I would ask why you think that CW proficiency is a good and valid filter for poor operators.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: Tue, 11 May 1993 19:31:38 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpcss01!capella!
jholly@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Kevin,
You got it almost right....Novice/Tech++ are allowed RTTY, but only
from 28.1 to 28.3 Mhz. During the RTTY contests, CQ WW and ARRL,
many Novice/Tech++'s are very happy to answer CQ's in the 28.1 to
28.11 or so region. Generally the activity pretty well stops by
28.115.
jim, WA6SDM
jholly@cup.hp.com

Date: Tue, 11 May 1993 19:25:13 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpcss01!capella!
jholly@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

/ capella:rec.radio.amateur.policy / a-kevinp@microsoft.COM (Kevin Purcell, Rho) /
10:31 am May 7, 1993 /
I read something in a recent Radio Fun column by KA1BUM (?) talking
about RTTY and Amtor -- the usual explanation then he said you needed
a General class license or above to use RTTY/Amtor on HF. This jangled
with a couple of other things I had heard so I went to my copy of Part 97.

So I looked up 97.301 (e). OK no frequency sharing requirements on 10m.

Then I looked at 97.505(c). Two entries apply:

Band	Freqs	Modes	Standard see 97.307(f)
10m	28.0 to 28.3	RTTY, Data	(4)
10m	28.3 to 28.5	Phone, Image	(1), (2) and (10)

97.307(f)

(4) RTTY limited to less than 1200 baud and 1kHz shift

(1) No angle modulated emission with modulation index > 1

(2) No none phone emission shall be no wider than a phone emission

(10) A station holding a Novice or Technician Class operator licence may only transmit CW emission using the international morse code or phone emissions J3E or R3E.

So it strikes me as some people are taking 97.307(f)(10) to mean you can only use CW/SSB on 10m if you are a novice/tech. But this is only half the truth as the rules really let you use 28.1 to 28.3 for RTTY, Amtor, Pactor, Packet etc in addition to CW. The comment in Radio Fun is inaccurate.

This also explains why the HTX-100 has mike connections that make it easy to attach to TNC or multi-mode controller.

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP

a-kevinp@microsoft.com

"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

Date: Wed, 12 May 93 02:19:20 GMT

From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!

bogus.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!

orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.@dog.ee.lbl.gov

Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Once upon a time, people used horses as an important mode of transportation. Horses were used to pull wagons and people sometimes used them individually to carry one person. If you were in the transportation business, you needed to know how to replace the shoes on a horse. If you didn't know how to shoe a horse, you were limited from doing a lot of business.

One upon a time, people used CW as an important mode of communication. CW was used by operators on ships and airplanes and in remote places to pass traffic, and individual hams used CW to communicate with other hams. If you were in the communications business, you needed to know how send and receive CW with the available equipment at the time, which was the human hand and ear (and maybe a semi-auto key). If you didn't know CW, you were limited from a lot of business.

Developments eventually made the horse obsolete as a primary mode of transportation. The automobile and train especially could move more people at higher speeds, in greater comfort. Eventually aircraft have replaced the use of horses for cross-country travel. No longer must one know how to shoe a horse to be in the transportation business.

Now, some people find horses pleasant to ride, as a recreation. So, some people still learn how to shoe horses, but they are specialists, sometimes enthusiasts themselves.

Now, CW has been replaced in commercial circuits by wire and fiber circuits, SITOR, voice modes, packet modes, satellite links, and a myriad of other automated services which provide greater throughput with less human effort. Some people still use CW as a commercial option, but only because they have yet to upgrade to the superior services now widely available. Most people today seem to use CW as a recreational pursuit.

Now that CW is a choice, not a necessary mode, shouldn't the legal requirements for CW knowledge be revamped to emphasize the communications modes most commonly in use?

Should a mechanic have to learn how to shoe a horse to work on modern fuel injected autos?

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 12 May 93 05:11:50 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ddsw1!indep1!clifto@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C6Gu9B.K9L@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU> jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (Jon Gefaell) writes:

>In article <QBE562E9@mmmpc6> hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:

>

>>Is this what you want?

>

>Do you realize you sound like a fool?

He certainly does. He doesn't allow for the fact that his proposed test is highly discriminatory against those with speech defects who may not be physically able to pronounce "QTH" or "QSL", to those who don't speak the same language as the ham they ask to recommend them, lower-income people who haven't had the opportunity to hear what a QSO is supposed to sound like

and are thus unable to properly conduct one in standard fashion, nor does he allow for the possibility that the operator on the other end of the QSO might use other Q signals, thus confounding the poor, unprepared operator (and it WOULD be cheating for the teacher to coach the student on the answers to the test, wouldn't it?).

Howard, you sound like a fool. Remove that highly discriminatory requirement from your proposed test, and you've got something everyone can live with.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|  WA9PDM      |      Use whichever one works                               |
+-----+
```

Date: 11 May 93 01:23:00 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!
mei.mon@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The Canonical list of Autopatch Answers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <C6MD60.Esv@amdcl2> brian@amdcl2.amd.com (Brian McMinn, N5PSS) writes:

>(Dan Roberts) writes:

>>

>> Would that be illegal due to the "not for business use" clause in the rule
>> book?

>Oh no, here we go again. Can I order pizza via the autopatch? Here
>is the canonical list of answers to this question. Please search for
>your favorite answer and then respond by number rather than with the
>entire text. Save net.bandwidth! :-)
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Perhaps we should all post in CW?? ;-)

Kevin Jessup, N9SQB EE and "no code" tech. And proud of it!

Temporarily using our companies corporate account. Many other individuals use it as well. Please state in any E-mail follow-ups that the mail is intended for me so as to avoid confusion. Thanks.

Marquette Electronics, Inc. account information follows...

--

mei.mon@mixcom.com

Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 05:56:19 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan)
writes:

>I can't specifically say, but I believe Tony is proposing to restructure
>access to V/UHF bands by license class, i.e. the non-coded tech would have
>all frequencies[sic] below 147.00 on 2 meters, and coded techs would only have
>access above 147.00. This would give non-coded techs an "incentive" (remember
>that folks, that's what our licensing system is supposed to have...) to
>upgrade beyond no-code.

Excuse me, but where in Part 97 does it state that our licensing system is
supposed to have "incentives"? Or more specifically where does it codify
granting spectrum and privileges based upon unrelated examinations? Or is
a Morse code test somehow related to operating FM phone on the 2 meter
band? Or perhaps there is some wording in there like the current
administration's definition of increasing the tax on social security
benefits as a spending cut.

I think the IARU had it right in 1985 when they were trying to push a
universal two tiered licensing structure. Amateurs would be automatically
granted operating privileges in whatever country they were traveling and
there would only be *two* classes of licenses. One would grant all
privileges on all amateur frequencies and would include a code test (they
must have felt the ITU wasn't ready to completely drop the code
requirement). The other would grant all privileges on all amateur
frequencies above 144 MHz and would not require a code test.

I'll have to look back and see whatever happened to that effort. Sounds
like the right direction to me. This other path seems headed towards
requiring an attorney at your station to interpret Part 97 and verify that
you have proper authorization to turn on your radio. ;-)

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 11 May 1993 17:38:09 -0500

From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!
emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: woops
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Sorry folks, that "band occupancy" post shouldabin in the .policy
newsgroup, not .misc, since I was replying to something that was
in the former. I keep forgetting that all the biassed postings
are in .policy, and when I reply to them in an unbiassed manner,
I think I must be in .misc :-)

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #139
